

APPEALS PROCESS FLOW CHART

Assessment/Decision/ Determination	Appeal First Stage	Appeal Second Stage	Appeal Third Stage
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITER: 'Does not meet expectations' • Summative assessment by RPC*: 'Failure to Progress' 	Review by Program (RPC)*	Schulich Postgraduate Appeal Committee ⁽¹⁾	No further right of appeal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denial by RPC* to affirm resident readiness for independent practice or denial of eligibility for certification examination 	Associate Dean PGME	Schulich Postgraduate Appeal Committee ⁽²⁾	No further right of appeal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denial of promotion by RPC* • Decision by RPC* that remediation is required • Decision by RPC* that probation is required • Determination by RPC* that remediation was unsuccessful • Determination by RPC* that probation was unsuccessful 	Schulich Postgraduate Appeal Committee ⁽¹⁾	No further right of appeal	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dismissal 	Schulich Postgraduate Appeal Committee ⁽³⁾	Dean's Office ⁽⁴⁾ (Dean or Delegate)	No further right of appeal.

*The Residency Program Committee (RPC) may delegate decision making to the Competence Committee (CC)

GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

Grounds for Appeal ⁽¹⁾:

- 1) the RPC did not take into consideration relevant information when it made its' decision;
- 2) the RPC's decision cannot be supported on the information that was before the RPC when it made its' decision; or
- 3) that in making the decision the RPC failed to follow this policy and that such failure could reasonably be seen to cast doubt on the correctness of that decision.

Grounds for Appeal ⁽²⁾:

- 1) the Associate Dean (AD) PGME did not take into consideration relevant information in making the decision;
- 2) the AD PGME's decision cannot be supported on the information that was before them; or
- 3) in making the decision the AD PGME failed to follow this policy and that such failure could reasonably be seen to cast doubt on the correctness of the decision.

Grounds for Appeal ⁽³⁾:

- 1) that the RPC or Associate Dean (AD) PGME did not take into consideration relevant information in making the decision;
- 2) that the decision made by the RPC or AD PGME cannot be supported on the information that was before the RPC or AD PGME at the time the decision was made; or
- 3) in making the decision the RPC or the AD PGME failed to follow this policy and that such failure could reasonably be seen to cast doubt on the correctness of the decision.

Grounds for Appeal ⁽⁴⁾:

There was a significant procedural error by the Schulich Postgraduate Appeal Committee that was prejudicial to the resident and casts doubt on the fairness of those procedures.